



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,355	07/06/2001	H. Craig Dees	PHO-122	5998
7590 04/13/2009 COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD. Suite 2850 200 West Adams St. Chicago, IL 60606			EXAMINER EPSP SMITH, JANET L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/900,355

Applicant(s)

DEES ET AL.

Examiner

Janet L. Epps-Smith

Art Unit

1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 36 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 10, 36 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1-21-2009 has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1, 9-11, and 36-37 are currently pending.

Drawings

4. In response to the objection to the Figures set forth in the prior Office Action, Applicants have provided replacement drawings for Figures 1a and 1b. As support for this amendment, Applicants merely assert that the specification as filed provides support for the amendment, however there is no specific reference to anywhere in the specification as filed that this support can be found. However, the newly added drawings are supported by the knowledge of one skilled in the art of the general structure of halogenated xanthene and Rose Bengal, see for example Shi et al. 1992.

Response to Arguments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. The rejection of claims 1, 9-11 and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the prior Office Action is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment to the claims, and arguments. However, new grounds of rejection are set forth below.
7. Claims 1, 10, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. Claims 1, and 36, and those claims dependent therefore, recite the limitation wherein the claimed pharmaceutical composition is "adapted for" chemotherapeutic treatment of cancer. The metes and bounds of the phrase "adapted for" are vague and indefinite such that the skilled artisan would not be able to ascertain the scope of the claimed invention.
9. The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment and in response to an interpretation of the instant claims, that all of the limitation associated with the use of the claimed compositions "for the treatment of cancer," are merely intended use limitations.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 1, 10, and 36-37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, and 8-9 of U.S. Patent No. 7390668. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the claims of the instant application and those of the issued patent are both drawn to pharmaceutical compositions comprising the halogenated xanthene disodium 4,5,6,7-tetrabromoerythrosin, wherein the halogenated xanthene is present at a concentration of greater than about 0.001% to less than about 20% in aqueous solution. The instant claims differ from the issued claims to the extent that the compositions of the issued claims do not recite wherein the pharmaceutical compositions are "adapted for chemotherapeutic treatment of cancer." Since there is no

structural distinction set forth in the claims associated with the term "adapted," and since the phrase "for chemotherapeutic treatment of cancer," is interpreted as an intended use limitation, absent evidence to the contrary, the compositions of issued US Patent read on pharmaceutical compositions of the instant invention.

12. Claims 1, 10, and 36-37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7384623. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the claims of the instant application and those of the issued patent are both drawn to pharmaceutical compositions comprising the halogenated xanthene disodium 4,5,6,7-tetrabromoerythrosin. The instant claims differ from the issued claims to the extent that the issued claims do not recite wherein the "halogenated xanthene is present at a concentration of greater than about 0.001% to less than about 20%" in aqueous solution. However, the issued claims as useful for the treatment of cancers and tumors. Absent evidence to the contrary, since the prior art compositions are disclosed as useful for the same purpose as the pharmaceutical compositions of the instant claims, it would have been obvious for the ordinary skilled artisan at the time of the instant invention, to identify the optimal or workable concentrations of the claimed pharmaceutical compositions for use in a method for the treatment of cancer by routine experimentation. See MPEP § 2144.05 [R-5] Obviousness of Ranges, which recites: "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges

Art Unit: 1633

by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janet L. Epps-Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-0757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 10:00 AM through 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Weitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Janet L. Epps-Smith/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633